



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,362	03/30/2004	Christian Mueller	ITC-335US	4981
23122	7590	10/17/2006	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			PATEL, PARESH H	
P O BOX 980			ART UNIT	
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980			PAPER NUMBER	
			2829	

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

311

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/813,362	Applicant(s) MUELLER, CHRISTIAN	
	Examiner Paresh Patel	Art Unit 2829	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43-76 and 85 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 50-60 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 43-49, 62 and 70-76 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 61-, 63-69, 85 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 61, 63-69 and 85 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 67 is objected to because of the following informalities: at line 2, "module feature" should read --feature--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 67 recites the limitation "module feature" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2829

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 61, 63, 66-68 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by bin Mohamed Hassan (US 6897645).

Regarding claim 61, 63, 66, 68 and 85, bin Mohamed Hassan (hereinafter Hassan) in fig. 1 and 10 discloses a docking module comprising: a feature detector [20, 22] for detecting a feature [40]; a movable feature receptacle (cam) [50 with 28a-b]; an actuator (linear)[28]; a movable feature (cam follower) [26 with 14] to capture and pull said feature in a linear direction [direction of 40] and moves in a different direction (perpendicular) than said linear direction, as further claimed.

Regarding claim 67, as best understood by Examiner, Hassan discloses said feature [40].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 64-65 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassan as applied to claim 61 above.

Art Unit: 2829

16 Regarding claims 64-65, Hassan discloses all the elements except for said actuator is pneumatic and is an electrical solenoid. Rather, Hassan discloses said actuator is linear as further claimed at claim 63. Therefore, it would have been obvious matter of design choice, since it is well known and Hassan also discloses linear actuator. Therefore, a person having ordinary skill in the art can at the time the invention was made to modify Hassan with claimed actuator i.e. pneumatic and is an electrical solenoid to actuate the devices to which it is connected to pull, push, shift or for intended/desired purpose.

9. Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassan as applied to claim 61 above, and further in view of Zahn (DE 2943864).

Regarding claim 69, Hassan discloses all the elements except for feature detector is one of a pneumatic switch and an electrical switch. Zahn discloses feature detector is one of a pneumatic switch and an electrical switch [36 or 43] for switching and control purpose. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the feature detector of Hassan with switches as taught by Zahn for advantages that Zahn has to offer so modified Hassan would have improved docking module.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 43-49, 62 and 70-76 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: After reviewing of the prior art references, the Examiner found that above claims (which are now amended to include allowable subject matter as stated in the office action of

Art Unit: 2829

05/03/2006) are now allowable for the same reason as stated in the office action of 05/03/2006.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2829

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paresh Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-1968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ha Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

 10/15/06
Paresh Patel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2829

October 15, 2006